

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/099,953	03/19/2002	Yasuhiro Ayukawa	1517-0138P	6331	
2292 75	590 07/20/2006		EXAMINER		
BIRCH STEV	VART KOLASCH & F	GAKH, YELENA G			
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	220.00		1743		
			DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	-	١,	. I
			٠.
-0		•	•

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/099,953	AYUKAWA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Yeiena G. Gakh, Ph.D.	1743		

zerere are runnig er an ruppear ziner	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Yeiena G. Gakn, Ph.D.	1743					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 07 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	int canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nt before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
3. Other: Yelena G. Gakh							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The language of the specification remains unclear and indefinite due to the poor translation from original Japanese document. The Applicants did not provide any reference confirming that X-ray irradiation can quantitatively degrade all organic sulfur compounds to elemental sulfur, which reacts with silver salts and precipitates. The Applicants did not provide a reaction scheme for degrading aromatic sulfur compounds that they disclose on page 145 of the "Handbook of Petroleum" using X-rays and reacting elemental sulfur with silver salts. The examiner is not aware of either process, and therefore the published evidence of such process should be provided by the applicants. What are "strong X-rays"? How strong should be such radiation to degrade all sulfur compounds to sulfur? While some degradation of compounds can be expected for strong X-ray irradiation, how is it proved to be quantitative? Measuring sulfur compounds to ppb levels using sulfur K-edge X-ray absorption near edge structure (XANES) spectrometry is well known in the art. However, the Applicants failed to provide evidence that they quantitatively capture all sulfur from the oil with their method. Table 2 demonstrates a well known method of X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy applied to reference samples with a known amount of sulfur.